# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/041,034 | 12/28/2001 | Peter Gassner | 021756-017130US | 2584 |

51206          7590          05/03/2007
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| VU, TUAN A |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2193 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 05/03/2007 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| | 10/041,034 | GASSNER ET AL. |
| **Office Action Summary** | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Tuan A. Vu | 2193 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 April 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.          2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>4-77</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>4-77</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1.      This action is responsive to the Applicant's response filed 4/5/07.

As indicated in Applicant's response, claims 1, 7,15, 21, 29, 37, 49, 55, 60, 65, 71, and

75-77 have been amended.  Claims 4-77 are pending in the office action.

### *Claim Objections*

2.      Claim 7 recites ''…code embedded therein *for executing instructions to said one or more*

*processors to perform the method of providing …* '.  This phrase appears to be awkward and

idiomatic a English language construct, thus requires properly punctuated restructuring to put

forth the proper semantic.

3.      Claims 15, 21, 29 and 37 require a "," (comma) between 'on a computer system' and

'comprising:' to render the claim more readable.  Further, claim 29 is objected to for reciting '…

*Internet application having processor readable storage devices*'; because the *Internet*

*application* is nowhere nearly disclosed as *having storage devices* but merely functionally

coupled to storage devices.

4.      Claims 4 and 37 are objected for reciting 'user-modifiable personalization engine user

interface tool'; there is no one clear description (i.e. an <u>user-modifiable engine which has</u> user

interface tool; or a personalization engine interface <u>tool that is user-modifiable</u> ) in the

Specifications commensurate with this convoluted entity so recited; and when it is disclosed that

personalizable data are user-modifiable using a tool, this above loaded phraseology is required to

be more compliant to the Specs lest a lack of description type of deficiency would be effectuated.

This will be treated as a personalization type of GUI-based tool to support user modification of

model or data thereof.

5.      Claim 49 is objected to for reciting "... code ... for executing instructions *to perform the*

*method comprising the steps of"*. The phraseology appears a run-on sentence and required

proper punctuation; e.g. 'to perform the method, the method comprising ...'.

6.      Claim 55 is objected to for reciting an awkward construct; that is, the long phrase

'...code embedded therein *for executing instructions to said one or more processors to perform*

*the method comprising the steps of:*' is a virtually a idiomatic and run-on English construct and

required rephrasing with proper punctuation.

7.      Claim 60 is objected to because it recites 'method for ... Internet application, *one or*

*more processor readable storage devices and one or more processors having processor readable*

*code embedded therein for executing ... of providing control function ...*' The phrase 'one or

more processor readable ... for a computer system' appears to be an inserted fragment of

sentence grammatically unconnected to the method claim of the onset. This would be treated as

though the Internet application is coupled with the processor storage devices and code. Further,

the phrase '...executing instructions *to said one or more processors to* perform' appears

awkward an English construct.

8.      Claims 65 and 71 are objected for reciting "executing instructions to said one or more

processors to perform the method comprising the steps of:" as set forth above; and this awkward

phraseology requires refurbishing with proper English syntax or punctuation.

9.      Claims 75-76 are objected to because of the following informalities: 'medium including

an Internet *application having processor readable storage devices*'. The language conveying

that the application being stored on a medium itself has storage devices appears improper a

context because an application on a medium cannot have storage devices.

10.     Claim 77 is objected to because of the phrase 'system *having means for implementing*

processor readable storage devices and ... code embedded therein' and 'for executing

instructions on a computer system comprising:". From the Specifications, there is no description

of a *means to implement* both <u>storage devices and code embedded therein</u>, and this impropriety

of claim language is bordering on what is referred to as a lack of description type USC § 112

deficiency. Further, there is a missing "," (comma) between 'on a computer system' and

"comprising:" as identified above.

11.     Claim 7 recites an overloaded limitation that cannot be corroborated with proper

description from scanning the Specifications; that is the 'user-modified functionality' of 'user-

customizable interaction model' (model whose specialization as interacting functionality has

been modified and persisted). The phrase amounts to an overloaded terminology being devoid of

implementation specifics, that is: *user-modified functionality of the user customizable*

*interaction model.* By this one of ordinary skill in the art would expect a model that specifically

shows communication icons between entities, and that this very multi-directional

flow/transacting in terms of functional components are modifiable and stored; that is, the iconic

representation and GUI components about this functional flow or communication (i.e. arrows or

linking objects) that are modified, not the data involved in the transaction. It is not seen from the

Specifications how can an 'interaction model' is implemented so that its underlying interaction

functionality would be user-modified and persisted. The model disclosed (see Fig. 1) is a tool

whereby personalization data are fetched and further modified by the user, and as a whole the

data forming the paradigm being user-customized are stored in form a model such that the model

being stored combines data and their relationship that have been manipulated by the user, no

interaction model per se being modified. That is, merely data pertinent to Internet Application

that are customized using a modeling tool. The above language is improper use and requires

restructuring. And it is recommended that **all independent claims** that recite the same

· 'functionality' about this 'customizable interaction model' be also corrected.

12.     In all, the claim language is marred with compounded terms/naming that appear to

include of entity within entity, or to subsume functionality under other functionality; and this is

leading to confusion when these compounded nomenclature is repeated under a slightly

rephrased format; and examples of such are instances of repeating terms like *user-modifiable,*

*user-modified, personalization system/data, user-modifiable personalization interface tool, user*

*application interface tool, customizable interaction model*, etc. When these naming is repeated

without specifics describing their underlying construct or functionality, the claim is leading to

broad interpretation, by default of lack of specificity that otherwise would ensnare connotation

imparted by such confusing terminology. Confusing claim language not only gets rejected but

will bear no significant patentable weight when it comes to giving the invention due merits to its

claim.     .

    **Appropriate correction is required lest** those instances of claim language usage and

impropriety lead to non-statutory subject matter, or USC 112 lack of description type of

rejection.

### *Double Patenting*

13.     The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine
grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or
improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible
harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed.
Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686

F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

14.      Claims 5, 7, 21, 60, 65, 71 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine

of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4, 44, 66, 72, and 81 of

copending Application No. 10,041,015 (hereinafter '015), in view of Beauchamp et al., USPN:

6,621,505.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from

each other because of the following observations.

Following are but a few examples as to how the certain claims from the instant invention

and from the above copending application are conflicting with each other.

**As per instant claim 5,** '015 claim 4 (or claim 44) recites an internet application system

with user interface and web server, a customizable interaction model ( i.e. a customizable

interaction model being the view-all-command), a metadata as in a repository for storing data

characterizing the model (data stored in a repository, data defining a property of an element of

the view all command); separately configurable interaction models ( i.e. more than one of the

plurality of application user interfaces), plurality of application user interfaces separately

configurable models (i.e. more than one generations of user interface are generated and

configured with said property). But '015 claim 4 does not recite personalization engine or user

profile interface configured to modify personalization data characterizing the customizable

model in more than one plurality of user interfaces, such user-modifiable personalization tool

allowing users to modify the functionality of elements in the interaction model for that user

(Note: *the personalization data allowing* limitation will be treated as the user's modifying of data

act). However, Beauchamp teaches an activity including a plurality of screens being customized

by client session and specific users using personal role and identity (e.g. col. 6, lines 45-48;

*registered* col. 24 lines 59-64; col. 21, lines 50-56; *access control* -col. 23, lines 8-19; col. 6,

lines 45-48; *registered* col. 24 lines 59-64). Based on the context in which plurality of interfaces

is generated with state per instances thereof being preserved to be linked with one another ('015

preserving a state), it would have been obvious that the plurality of interfaces being generated for

a view-all-command be allocated with means of verifying by Beauchamp (personalization engine

or profile interface) such that specific linking of screens per session of one user would enable the

customizing environment for a specific user (as in modifying functionality of elements on the

customizable view or modeling interface) be verified before repository assets or application data

can be distributed for such user's access and usage, i.e. 'allowing users to modify the

functionality of elements in the interaction model for that user'.

**As per instant claims 7, 21**, '015 claim 4, or 44 does not recite communication timing

but this timing is disclosed in Beauchamp (e.g. *one at a time* – col. 9, lines 31-46). It would have

been obvious to add this timing step to '015 claim 5 context so that the Beauchamp's teaching in

view of the user's customizing context in the instant claims based on the communication therein,

would alleviate network usage or bandwidth by determining a correct time by which further data

would need to be downloaded to a user-specific environment.

**As per instant claims 60, 65, 71,** '015 claims 66, 72, and 81 also recite generating

HTML to incorporate into a model after using metadata in a page definition from a server via a

client request.

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

15.    The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

16.    Claims 4-6, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

Claims 4 and 37 are rejected as indefinite teaching for reciting 'user-modifiable

personalization engine user interface tool'; there is no one clear description (i.e. an user-

modifiable ...engine which has user interface tool; or a personalization engine interface tool that

is user-modifiable ) in the Specifications that would enable one of ordinary skill in the art to

construe that a personalization engine interface tool is user-modifiable.  The metes and bounds

associated with this convoluted limitation as recited leads to uncertainty.   When in fact it is

disclosed that personalizable data are user-modifiable using a tool, this above overly loaded

phraseology is required to be more compliant to the Specs because one cannot make use of the

invention based on such indefiniteness.  This will be treated as a personalization type of GUI-

based tool to support user modification of model or data thereof.

17.    Refer to the above Claim Objections to be apprised on the 'compound nomenclature'

being used extensively throughout the claims, all of which leading to misinterpretation or hard to

understand limitations.

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

18.     The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

19.     Claims 4-27, 29-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Beauchamp et al., USPN: 6,621,505 (hereinafter Beauchamp).

**As per claim 4,** Beauchamp discloses a customizable application system having

processor readable storage devices and processor readable code embedded therein for executing

instructions on the computer system, comprising:

an internet application system operable to support an internet application, the internet

application associated with metadata (Fig. 10, 12) configured for generating a plurality of

application user interfaces each having a customizable interaction model (e.g. *screens linked ...*

*activity* – col. 4, lines 24-30; *predefined process* – col. 6, lines 49-59 – Note: activity related to a

predefined process requiring linking of screens reads on a business target *model*), the internet

application system including:

an user interface generator operable to generate the application user interface (e.g. col. 5,

lines 12-16; *navigational control data, rendering screens, list screens, launch screens* - col. 6,

lines 7-44), and

a web application server operable to deliver the application user interface to a client (col.

5, line 63 to col. 6, line 15; col. 6, lines 45-48);

a personalization system including a personalization engine ( e.g. *protocol, HTTP* – col.

6, lines 45-48; registered col. 24 lines 59-64 - Note: protocol-bound session per client for HTTP

request and login registration reads on personalization engine) and a user profile interface (e.g.

col. 21, lines 50-56; access control -col. 23, lines 8-19 – Note: back end user being administered

via enterprise control processes related to business object access/use reads on personal data being

profiled for such access eligibility),

the personalization system operable to allow a user to modify personalization data

characterizing the customizable interaction model (e.g. *customize* - col. 4, lines 44-46) in a

plurality of application user interfaces (*standardized screens, screen-to-screen* -- col. 4, lines 23-

39); and a

user-modifiable personalization interface tool allowing a user to modify customizable

interaction model for that user (Note: reusable screens being initially presented and subsequently

customized by user to accommodate a particular process based on metadata for rendering such

screen **reads on** modifying customizable interaction model being presented for the user – see

col. 4 , li. 44-46; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 44; col. 15, lines 45-48); and

a data repository including a data record for storing the personalization data (see step 402

–Fig. 14A), the data record being accessible using the metadata (col. 23, lines 39-49).

**As per claim 5**, Beauchamp discloses wherein members of the plurality of application

user interfaces include separately configurable interaction models (e.g. col. 4, lines 24-30; col.

26, line 55 to col. 27, line 9; col. 17 lines 13-34).

**As per claim 6**, Beauchamp discloses that timing of communication between the client

and the web application server is responsive to the interaction model (e.g. *one at a time* – col. 9,

lines 31-46; Fig. 14A-B).

**As per claim 7**, Beauchamp discloses a system embodied in a computer-readable

medium for developing an internet application including an application user interface, the system

comprising:

an integrated development environment (integrated – col. 31-45) configured for a

developer to specify a user interface element (e.g. Fig. 3-5) in the internet application user

interface, the user interface element having a user customizable interaction model (e.g. *Activity* -

col. 4, lines 24-30, *customize* - lines 44-46; *tree ...hierarchically* -col. 6, lines 16-23; *predefined*

*process* – col. 6, lines 49-59; col. 17 lines 13-34),

the user customizable interaction model configured to determine timing of

communication between a client displaying the application user interface and a server supporting

the internet application (e.g. *one at a time* – col. 9, lines 31-46 – Note: feeding to a client side

data according to one-at-a-time basis reads on determining on timing between providers and

recipient client),

the user customizable interaction model allowing each user of the interface to modify

functionality of the user interface element (**Note:** reusable screens being presented and

customized by user to accommodate a particular process based on metadata for rendering such

screen **reads on** modifying functionality of a customizable interface or model elements being

presented – see col. 4 , li. 44-46; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 44; col. 15, lines 45-48 -- because

each interface elements such as screens have intrinsic functionality relative to the model being

customized);

application designer configured to produce metadata (e.g. col. 6, lines 59-65) to

characterize the user customizable interaction model; and

a data repository including a user modifiable data record configured to further

characterize the user-modifiable functionality (see above **Note**) of the user customizable

interaction model (col. 6, lines 49-65), the data record being accessible using the metadata (col.

5, lines 32-58 – Note: rendering of screens based on stored metadata reads on using metadata to

access predefined process associated screens);

wherein said access is executed by processors having embedded code therein for

executing the method for accessing a data storage in enterprise wide computer system (e.g.

JDBC, distributed – col. 19, line 31 to col. 20, line 10col. 20 lines 21-25).

**As per claim 8**, Beauchamp discloses that the integrated development environment is

further configured to specify display of an interaction model control command (Fig. 3) in the

application user interface, the interaction model control command being configured for a user

(e.g. col. 11, lines 1-26; Fig. 14A-B) to change the user customizable interaction model.

**As per claim 9**, Beauchamp discloses deferred and immediate modes (e.g. step 418 –

*waits* Fig. 14A; step 406, Fig. 14A – Note: immediate login feedback and waits for user reads on

immediate and deferred modes, respectively).

**As per claim 10**, Beauchamp discloses that the user customizable interaction model is

configurable according to the identity of a user or the identity of the client (e.g. *User, Role* - step

426, Fig. 14A)

**As per claim 11,** Beauchamp discloses that a state of the user customizable interaction model is further configurable to persist (e.g. *reused* – col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 18, lines 9-21) between uses of the application user interface.

**As per claims 12-14,** Beauchamp discloses that a modifiable record is user modifiable using a configuration system (e.g. col. 4, lines 23-46; Fig. 3-5), wherein the user modifiable data record is user modifiable using a personalization system (e.g. col. 6, lines 45-48; *registered* col. 24 lines 59-64; col. 21, lines 50-56; access control -col. 23, lines 8-19); wherein the personalization system is included in the internet application (col. 6, lines 45-48; *registered* col. 24 lines 59-64).

**As per claim 15,** Beauchamp discloses a customizable application system having processor readable storage devices and processor readable code embedded therein for executing instructions on the computer system, comprising:

an internet application system configured to support an internet application (col. 4, lines 23-39); an application user interface including a user interface element, the application user interface configured as an interface between the internet application and a user (e.g. Fig. 3-5);

the user interface element including a customizable interaction model (e.g. *Activity* - col. 4, lines 24-30, *customize* - lines 44-46; *predefined process* – col. 6, lines 49-59; col. 17 lines 13-34) allowing the user to modify functionality of the user interface element (see col. 4 , li. 44-46; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 44; col. 15, lines 45-48 – Note: each interface elements such as screens have intrinsic functionality relative to the model being customized), the user interface element with user-modifiable functionality configured for delivery to a client over a computer network (col. 5, lines 30-59);

metadata characterizing the customizable interaction model (e.g. *metadata* - col. 5, lines

32-58; col. 6, lines 58-62); and

a data repository including a data record for characterizing with the customizable

interaction model, the data record being user modifiable(e.g. col. 6, lines 49-65; col. 5, lines 32-

58) and being accessible using the metadata.

**As per claim 16**, Beauchamp discloses wherein the application user interface is

configured for display on the client using standard web browser protocols (e.g. col. 6, lines 16-

48).

**As per claim 17**, Beauchamp discloses wherein the application user interface is further

configured for display on the client using features of a web browser (col. 15, line 50 to col. 16,

line 34), the features not requiring a browser add-on, plug-in, or extension.

**As per claims 18-20**, Beauchamp discloses means for generating the application user

interface using the metadata (e.g. col. 6, lines 57-62; col. 18, lines 9-21); including a

configuration system configured to modify the data record (e.g. col. 4, lines 23-46; Fig. 3-5 –

Note: navigation by user from screens to have process data populated into a standard screens

reads on modifying a record); wherein the configuration system is included in the internet

application (e.g. *HTML page 36* –Applications, Fig. 2).

**As per claim 21**, Beauchamp discloses an internet application system having processor

readable storage devices and processor readable code embedded therein for executing

instructions on the computer system, comprising:

a user interface generator configured to generate an application user interface (e.g. col. 5, lines 12-16; *navigational control data, rendering screens, list screens, launch screens* - col. 6, lines 7-44),

the application user interface being compatible with a standard web browser and being generated in response to a request from a user (col. 6, line 45 to col. 7, line 40),

the user interface including a user customizable interaction model (e.g. *Activity* - col. 4, lines 24-30, *customize* - lines 44-46; *predefined process* – col. 6, lines 49-59; col. 17 lines 13-34), the user customizable interaction model configured to determine timing of communication from a client displaying the application user interface (*one at a time* – col. 9, lines 31-46), the user customizable interaction model further allowing each user of the interface to modify functionality of at least one user interface element (see col. 4 , li. 44-46; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 44; col. 15, lines 45-48 -- Note: each interface elements such as screens have intrinsic functionality relative to the model being customized);

a web application server configured to deliver the application user interface including the user-modified functionality to the client (e.g. col. 15, lines 50-65); and an internet application accessible to the user through the generated application user interface (Fig. 3-5; *HTML page 36 –* Applications, Fig. 2) .

**As per claim 22**, Beauchamp discloses wherein the user interface generator is further configured to use metadata (e.g. *metadata* - col. 5, lines 32-58; col. 6, lines 58-62) to characterize the user customizable interaction model.

As per claim 23, Beauchamp discloses wherein the user customizable interaction model

is specific to a user interface element (Fig. 14A; User/Role – step 456 –Fig. 14B; *Customer*

*specific* - Fig. 16) included in the application user interface.

As per claim 24, Beauchamp discloses wherein the user interface generator is

customizable interaction model (e.g. Fig. 3-5; step 414, Fig. 14A).

As per claims 25-27, refer to corresponding rejections as set forth in claims 12, 10, and 9

respectively.

As per claim 29, Beauchamp discloses an internet application having processor readable

storage devices and processor readable code embedded therein for executing instructions on the

computer system, comprising:

a computer program embodied in a computer-readable medium and configured to run on

an internet application system; an application user interface including a user interface element

(e.g. *predefined process, screen, tree ... hierarchically* - col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 23 – Note:

activity screens with tree screen for hierarchically presenting a *predefined process* reads on

interface element for interactively customizing a model) with a customizable interaction model,

the application user interface configured for delivery (e.g. Fig. 7-10) to a client and to operate as

an interface between a user and the computer program;

a user modifiable data record stored in a location physically remote from the client (e.g.

col. 5, lines 41-53; Fig. 7-10), the data record configurable for use by a user interface generator

to generate the application user interface, the data record (e.g. *metadata, reused ...screens*

*navigational control data, rendering screens, list screens, launch screens* - col. 6, lines 7-44)

configurable by a user to allow the user to modify functionality of the user interface element, the

record characterizing the customizable interaction model including user-modified functionality

(e.g. col. 5, lines 12-16; *navigational control data, rendering screens, list screens, launch*

*screens* - col. 6, lines 7-44 – Note: each model being customized signifies being recorded so to

encompass the customized elements being acted upon by the user for a particular web

application); and

metadata configurable for use by the user interface generator to access the user

modifiable data record (e.g. col. 5, lines 49-59).

**As per claims 30-32,** refer to corresponding rejections as set forth in claims 9, 10, and 13

respectively.

**As per claim 33,** Beauchamp discloses an application user interface embodied in a

computer readable medium and configured for communication between a user and an internet

application,

the application user interface being generated using metadata (e.g. Fig. 10, 12; col. 5,

lines 49-59) configured to access a user modifiable data record (Fig. 7-10) allowing the user to

modify functionality of at least one user interface element (col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 44; col.

15, lines 45-48) in the application user interface,

the application user interface including the at least one user interface element (col. 5, line

60 to col. 6, line 23 ) configured for display using a standard web browser,

the user interface element including a user customizable interaction model, the user

customizable interaction model being characterized by the user modifiable data record (e.g. Fig.

7-10; *navigational control data, rendering screens, list screens, launch screens* - col. 6, lines 7-

44).

**As per claims 34-35**, refer to corresponding rejections as set forth in claims 26-27, respectively.

**As per claim 36**, Beauchamp discloses wherein the user customizable interaction model is responsive to a command displayed on the interface (e.g. Fig. 3-5, Fig. 14A)

**As per claim 37**, Beauchamp discloses a customizable application system having processor readable storage devices and processor readable code embedded therein for executing instructions on the computer system, comprising:

an internet application system configured to support an internet application, the internet application including metadata configured for generating an application user interface, the internet application system including,

a user interface generator (to generate ...), and

a web application server (to deliver ...) the application user interface to a client,

an application development system configured to generate the metadata, the metadata being further configured to characterize a user customizable interaction model of the application user interface ( see Fig. 10, 12);

a configuration system including a configuration engine and a configuration interface, the configuration interface configured to modify configuration data characterizing the user customizable interaction model;

a personalization system including a personalization engine ( e.g. *protocol, HTTP* – col. 6, lines 45-48; registered col. 24 lines 59-64 - Note: protocol-bound session per client for HTTP request and login registration reads on personalization engine) and a user profile interface tool (e.g. col. 21, lines 50-56; access control -col. 23, lines 8-19 – Note: back end user being

administered via enterprise control processes related to business object access/use reads on

personal data being profiled for such access eligibility),

the personalization system to allow users to modify personalization data characterizing

the customizable interaction model (e.g. *customize* - col. 4, lines 44-46) in more than one of the

plurality of application user interfaces (*standardized screens, screen-to-screen* -- col. 4, lines 23-

39);

the user-modifiable personalization UI tool allowing the users each to modify

customizable interaction model for that user (Note: reusable screens being initially presented and

subsequently customized by user to accommodate a particular process based on metadata for

rendering such screen **reads on** modifying customizable interaction model being presented for

that user – see col. 4 , li. 44-46; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 44; col. 15, lines 45-48); and

a data repository including a data record configured to store the configuration and

personalization data (Note: reusable screens and metadata reads on configuration and

personalization data being recorded) the data record being accessible using the metadata; most of

these limitations being similar to those recited in claim 4.

Hence, the rejection of these similar limitations is to be referred back to the respective

rejections as set forth in claim 4.

**As per claim 38**, Beauchamp discloses a method of developing an application user

interface associated with an internet application, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting a user customizable interaction model characterized by a data record (e.g. Fig.

10, steps 410 → 414, Fig. 14A; step *452*, Fig. 14B), the data record being stored in a data

repository and being user modifiable allowing the user to modify functionality of the user

interface element (see col. 4 , li. 44-46; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 44; col. 15, lines 45-48), the

data repository being physically remote from a client used to display the application user

interface ( e.g. Fig. 10, 12 );

including the user customizable interaction model in the application user interface (step

434, Fig. 14B);.

generating metadata characterizing the user customizable interaction model including the

user-modified functionality(e.g. Fig. 9-10 ; col. 5, lines 12-16; *navigational control data,*

*rendering screens, list screens, launch screens* - col. 6, lines 7-44 – Note: each model being

customized signifies being recorded so to encompass the customized elements being acted

upon(or modified) by the user for a particular web application), the metadata including a

reference to the data record; and storing the metadata in association with the internet application

(e.g. steps 464, 466- Fig. 14B; Fig. 10; *reused* – col. 4, lines 31-46), the internet application

being configured for access using the application user interface.

**As per claim 39**, Beauchamp discloses wherein the application user interface includes an

interaction model control command (e.g. Fig. 3-5, Fig. 14A).

**As per claim 40**, Beauchamp discloses determining when communication occurs

between the client and the internet application responsive to the interaction model (e.g. step 408,

Fig 14A; steps 440 through steps 446, 452, 466, 472, 478, Fig. 14B).

**As per claim 41**, Beauchamp discloses a method of generating an application user

interface, the method comprising the steps of:

accessing a page definition, the page definition (e.g. Fig. 8, *metadata* - Fig. 13) including

metadata associated with a customizable property of a interaction model;

accessing a data record using the metadata, the data record being stored in a data

repository and being user modifiable (Fig. 9), allowing the user to modify the customizable

property (see col. 4 , li. 44-46; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 44; col. 15, lines 45-48 – Note: any

metadata representing a property to render an application reads on property being modified via

customizing screens of a model instance)the data repository being physically remote

from a client used to display the application user interface (e.g. Fig. 8; col. 5, line 41 to col. 6,

line 34) ;

determining a value characterizing the customizable property (e.g. col. 6, line 52-65; Fig

14A-B – Note: using metadata to specify customizable screens according to a predefinition reads

on customizable property associated with the screens being selected via the XML specification

or personal or reusable/legacy data stored in server – col. 21, lines 40-67, Fig. 6) using the data

record;

generating markup-language responsive to the determined value (e.g. col. 15, line 51 to

col. 16, line 3); and including the generated markup-language in the application user interface the

application user interface being an interface to an internet application (e.g. Fig. 2).

**As per claims 42 and 44,** refer to claim 13, and 10, respectively.

**As per claim 43,** Beauchamp discloses wherein the customized property includes a

deferred mode (step 418 – *waits* Fig. 14A).

**As per claim 45,** Beauchamp discloses a method of developing an HTML based

application user interface including a user customizable interaction model, the method

comprising the steps of:

selecting a user customizable interaction model associated with a data record (e.g. step

452, Fig. 14A) and specifying functionality of at least one interface element in the application

user interface (col. 4 , li. 44-46; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 44; col. 15, lines 45-48 -- Note:

each interface elements such as screens being specified by users have intrinsic functionality

relative to the model being customized),

the data record being configurable by the user (Note: each model being customized

signifies being recorded so to encompass the customized elements being acted upon(or modified)

by the user for a particular web application) for characterizing the user customizable interaction

model; the user customizable interaction model including a plurality of interaction modes (e.g.

*screens , predefined process* - col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 23; Fig. 3-5);

including the user customizable interaction model in the HTML based application user

interface (e.g. Fig. 2, 9);

generating metadata characterizing the user customizable interaction model, the metadata

including a reference to the data record (steps 464, 466- Fig. 14B; Fig. 10); and storing the

metadata in association with an application, the application being configured for access using the

application user interface ( e.g. *reused* – col. 4, lines 31-46 ).

**As per claims 46-47**, refer to claims 36 and 9, respectively.

**As per claim 48**, Beauchamp discloses wherein a customizable state of the user

customizable interaction model is configurable to persist between uses of the HTML based

application user interface (*reused* – col. 4, lines 31-46).

**As per claim 49**, Beauchamp discloses a computer-implemented method of customizing

a interaction model in an HTML based application user interface, the interface digitally coupled

to processor readable storage devices and processors having processor readable code embedded

therein for executing instructions to perform the method, the method comprising the steps of:

accessing a configuration system, the configuration system including a configuration

engine and a configuration interface (e.g. *business object, predefined process, screens*- col. 5,

line 40 to col. 6, line 15);

selecting, using the configuration interface (Fig. 14A-B; Fig. 2 ), a user interface element

(e.g. *navigational control data, rendering screens, list screens, launch screens* - col. 6, lines 7-

44) in the HTML based application user interface, the user interface element including a user

customizable interaction model; and

specifying configuration data using the configuration interface, the configuration data

characterizing the user customizable interaction model and specifying functionality of at least

one interface element in the application user interface (col. 4 , li. 44-46; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6,

line 44; col. 15, lines 45-48); the configuration data being stored in a data repository physically

remote from a client used to view the HTML-based application user interface (e.g. col. 5, line 40

to col. 6, line 44; Fig. 14A-B – Note: information retrieved from metadata to associate plurality

of screens to link reads on configuration data being specified for a screens selection).

**As per claim 50**, Beauchamp discloses including a step of including a command to

modify the user customizable interaction model, in the HTML based application user interface

(Assign, Pause, Cancel, Next -- Fig. 3-4).

**As per claim 51**, wherein the configuration data is configurable to characterize a subset

of all user interface elements (e.g. *hierarchically, navigational control data, rendering screens,*

*list screens, launch screens* - col. 6, lines 7-44 – Note: list of screens and hierarchy of navigable

screens reads on subsets of interface elements configurable by the user) in the HTML based

application user interface.

As per claims 52-53, refer to rejection in claims 6 (e.g. col. 9, lines 31-46; Fig. 14A-B),

and 13, respectively.

As per claim 54, see Beauchamp (see Fig. 6-8, 12-13).

As per claim 55, Beauchamp discloses a computer-implemented method of customizing

an interaction model in an application user interface, the interface digitally coupled to one or

more processor readable storage devices and one or more processors having processor readable

code embedded therein for executing instructions to said one or more processors to perform the

method comprising the steps of:

accessing a configuration system, the configuration system including a configuration

engine and a configuration interface;

selecting, using the configuration interface, the interaction model in the application user

interface, the interaction model being user customizable;

specifying configuration data using the configuration interface, the configuration data

characterizing the interaction model; and specifying functionality of at least one interface

element in the application user interface (col. 4 , li. 44-46; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 44; col.

15, lines 45-48).  All of which steps have been addressed in claim 49 above.

Beauchamp further discloses storing the configuration data (Fig. 13); and generating the

application user interface using the specified configuration data ( Fig. 14A-B), the application

user interface being HTML based (Fig. 6-8, 12-13) and being configured to access an internet

application.

**As per claims 56-58**, refer to corresponding rejections as set forth in claims 54, 35, and 36, respectively.

**As per claim 59**, Beauchamp discloses that configuration data is user modifiable (refer to claims 8, 12-13).

**As per claim 60**, Beauchamp discloses a computer-implemented method of executing an internet application, one or more processor readable storage devices and one or more processors having processor readable code embedded therein for executing instructions to said processors to perform a method of providing a control function for a computer system, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving a request for an application user interface from a client, the application user interface including a user interface element;

accessing a page definition, the page definition including metadata characterizing the application user interface;

retrieving a value characterizing a customizable interaction model associated with the user interface element using the metadata, the value being stored in a data repository physically remote (Fig. 9) from the client, the value being specified ( Note: a given screen GUI item being selected reads on a value being chosen – see Fig. 5, Fig. 15 – because each screen is stored as a repository value) by a user in order to modify functionality of at least one interface element in the application user interface (col. 4 , li. 44-46; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 44; col. 15, lines 45-48); i.e. all of which steps limitations have been addressed in claim 41.

generating HTML responsive to the retrieved value; including the generated HTML in the application user interface (e.g. col. 15, line 51 to col. 16, line 3; Fig. 10-13); and delivering

the application user interface to the client, the application user interface being an interface

between a user and the internet application (*screens* – Fig. 14A-B).

**As per claims 61, 63**, refer to claim 27, 54, respectively.

**As per claims 62, 64**, refer to the rationale addressing personalization of claims 10, 13.

**As per claim 65**, Beauchamp discloses a computer-implemented method of generating an

application user interface including a customizable interaction model, the interface digitally

coupled to one or more processor readable storage devices and one or more processors having

processor readable code embedded therein for executing instructions to said processors to

perform the method comprising the steps of:

accessing a page definition (XML metadata – col. 6, lines 60-65) , the page definition

including metadata characterizing the customizable interaction model, the customizable

interaction model configured to characterize communication from a client (e.g. *screens* - Fig.

14), the client being configurable to display the application user interface (e.g. Fig. 3-5);

reading a value from a data record using the metadata (col. 15, line 51 to col. 16, line 3),

the data record being stored in a data repository and being user modifiable allowing a user to

modify functionality of at least one interface element in the application user interface (col. 4 , li.

44-46; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 44; col. 15, lines 45-48), the data repository being physically

remote from the client (e.g. col. 5, line 40 to col. 6, line 44);

characterizing a state of the customizable interaction model using the value (e.g. *User

selects, Client sends State, Determine next Screen* – Fig. 14B); generating HTML responsive to

the state (steps 440 through steps 446, 452, 466, 472, 478, Fig. 14B – Note: generating of

metadata from the user feedback reads on generating HTML responsive to state and

incorporating such HTML in the application); and including the generated HTML in the

application user interface(e.g. col. 15, line 51 to col. 16, line 3).

**As per claims 66-70**, refer to the corresponding rejections addressing claims 51, 58, 11,

54, and 44, respectively.

**As per claim 71**, Beauchamp discloses a computer-implemented method of generating an

application user interface configured for delivery a server to a client, the interface digitally

coupled to one or more processor readable storage devices and one or more processors having

processor readable code embedded therein for executing instructions to said processors to

perform the method comprising the steps of:

receiving, at the server, a request for the application user interface from the client;

identifying the requester of the application user interface, the application user interface

including a user customizable interaction model;

accessing a page definition, the page definition including metadata and characterizing the

application user interface ( *XML metadata* - col. 5, line 38 to col. 6, line 6);

retrieving, using the metadata and the identity of the requester, a value for

characterizing the user customizable interaction model, the value being selected by a requestor in

order to modify functionality of at least on UI element in the application user interface ( Note: a

given screen GUI item being selected reads on a value being chosen – see Fig. 5, Fig. 15 –

because each screen is stored as a repository), the value being stored in a data repository (screens

- Fig. 14A-B; Fig. 9 and related text – Note: screen identifier or *NameValue* being parsed from

XML file reads on value stored in repository );

generating HTML incorporating the interaction model using the value; including the

generated HTML in the application user interface (Fig. 10-13); and delivering the application

user interface from the server to the client.

**As per claims 72-74**, refer to the corresponding rejections addressing claims 6, 9, and 39,

respectively.

**As per claim 75**, Beauchamp discloses a computer readable medium including an

internet application having processor readable storage devices and processor readable code

embedded therein for executing instructions on the computer system, the internet application

comprising:

metadata defining an application user interface, the application user interface including a

interface element with a user customizable interaction model allowing a user to modify

functionality of at least one interface element in the application user interface (col. 4 , li. 44-46;

col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 44; col. 15, lines 45-48),

the application user interface configured for delivery to a client and configured to operate

as an interface between a user and the internet application ( e.g. *metadata, screens, predefined

process* - col. 5 line 40 to col. 6, line 44; col. 6, lines 60-65);

a user interface generator configured to generate the application user interface using a

user modifiable data record (e.g. metadata, screens – Fig. 14A-B; col. 6, lines 60-65) stored in a

location physically remote from the client,

the user modifiable data record configurable to characterize the user customizable

interaction model including the user-modifiable functionality (e.g. Fig. 9-10 ; col. 5, lines 12-16;

*navigational control data, rendering screens, list screens, launch screens* - col. 6, lines 7-44 –

Note: model being customized with screens specified by users for a targeted application instance

reads on record including user-modifiable functionality); and

a configuration system configured for a user to modify the user modifiable data record

(e.g. *predefined process, rendering screens, tree screen, populating, editing* - col. 6, lines 13-65).

**As per claim 76,** Beauchamp discloses a computer readable medium including an

internet application having processor readable storage devices and processor readable code

embedded therein for executing instructions on a computer system, the internet application

comprising:

an application designer configured to develop an application user interface (Fig. 8-11),

the user interface including a user interface element allowing each user of the interface to modify

functionality of the user interface element (**Note:** reusable screens being presented and

customized by user to accommodate a particular process based on metadata for rendering such

screen **reads on** modifying functionality of a customizable interface or model elements being

presented – see col. 4 , li. 44-46; col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 44; col. 15, lines 45-48),

the application user interface configured for delivery to a client and configured to operate

as an interface between a user and the internet application (e.g. *metadata, screens, predefined*

*process* - col. 5 line 40 to col. 6, line 6);

a user interface generator configured to generate the application user interface using a

user modifiable data record stored in a location physically remote from the client (e.g. col. 6,

lines 13-65),

the user modifiable data record configurable to characterize the user customizable

interaction model (e.g. metadata, screens – Fig. 14A-B) including the user-modifiable

functionality ( see above **Note** because each model reads on a record of the customized

elements); and a configuration system configured for a user to modify the user modifiable data

record.

As per claim 77, Beauchamp discloses an application execution system having means for

implementing processor storage devices and processor readable code embedded therein for

executing instructions on a computer system, comprising:

means for supporting an internet application (Fig. 2);

means for allowing each user of the interface to modify functionality of the user interface

element (**Note**: reusable screens being presented and customized by user to accommodate a

particular process based on metadata for rendering such screen **reads on** modifying functionality

of a customizable interface or model elements being presented – see col. 4 , li. 44-46; col. 5, line

60 to col. 6, line 44; col. 15, lines 45-48)

means for generating the application user interface (e.g. *rendering* - col. 6, lines 13-65;

col. 4, lines 24-30) using a user modifiable data record configured to store data characterizing a

user customizable interaction model (col. 6, lines 60-65) including the user-modifiable

functionality (e.g. Fig. 9-10 ; col. 5, lines 12-16; *navigational control data, rendering screens,*

*list screens, launch screens* - col. 6, lines 7-44); and

means for providing the application user interface to a user, the application user interface

including the at least one user interface element (*screens* – Fig. 14A-B), the application user

interface configured as an interface between the internet application and the user, the user

interface element including the user customizable interaction model (e.g. *tree ...hierarchically,*

*predefined process* - col. 5 line 40 to col. 6, line 6), the user interface element configured for

delivery to a client over a computer network (Fig. 14A-B; Fig. 9).

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

20.     The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

21.     Claims 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauchamp et

al., USPN: 6,621,505 as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Helgeson et al. USPN:

6,643,652 ( hereinafter Helgeson).

**As per claim 28**, Beauchamp does not disclose a client wireless system; but at the time

the invention was made, the use of browser markup language as carrier of specification data, --

such as XML -- has been used to communicate with devices in all type of networks wherein

wireless protocol for wireless portable or embedded processing units was a known and evolving

methodology.   In a method to extend the browser functionality similar to Beauchamp creating of

browser metadata (Fig. 6), Helgeson discloses a client machine being a wireless device (cellular

phone 411, Fig. 4).   Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to include in the client system of Beauchamp wireless devices as

taught by Helgeson because rendering of client interface environment using metadata specified

via a carrier like XML metadata would enable those wireless system to obtain support from

server providers without a sustained link with such service; and thus by means of wireless

protocol as taught above XML-formatted specification would provide resource-efficient support

for dynamic for a as-needed basis application specification in order to render browser

functionality as purported by Beauchamp, in view of the known concept that wireless devices

entail restricted storage resources.

### Response to Arguments

22.     Applicant's arguments filed 4/5/07 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. Following are the Examiner's observation in regard thereto.

**Provisional Double Patenting Rejection:**

(A)     Applicants have submitted that Beauchamp's teaching of user-selected screens entails

pre-defined interfaces being linked together in a predetermined order; and this is not

personalizing user interaction whereby the user can have freedom in modifying a wide variety of

designs according to user customization as contemplated by the INVENTION ( Appl. Rmrks pg.

20). The requirement that user would have freedom on modifying designs via a tool is not

actually recited in the claims; and neither is the precluding of any 'predetermined order' a

requirement to meet from how the recited 'customizable' or 'personalization' capability are

termed in the respective claims. As for the personalization tool, or interface thereof, the claim

fails to enforce a clear description as to what personalization is all about, except for the fact it via

its GUI interface allow a user to customize a interaction model, with this interaction model left at

an empty name without specifics as to describing how it is a interaction model and how by being

customizable it contribute to any semblance of personalization process. The claim amounts to

superfluously repeating of somewhat overloaded terminology without depiction of what this

quantity of terms amounts to specifically (e.g. *personalization data, customizable interaction*

*model, user-modifiable personalization interface tool, user profile interface*); thereby lacks the

detailed mechanics depicting the underlying functionality or structural constitution of the terms

recited. Beauchamp tool is perceived as meeting all the elements recited that via broad

interpretation ( for lacks of implementation specifics in the language) because Beauchamp tool

enable a user via its own and personalized GUI interface modify default template/screens and

customize these into some model with functionality meeting this very user requirements.

Beauchamp's GUI tool has mapped what is interpreted as personalization engine and interaction

model being customizable in that it enables for each user instance a retrieved set of screens

enabling modification or modeling (by that very user) of data therein ; rendering the argument

about predetermined order misplaced for not being commensurate with the extent at which the

claim language is interpreted. The Provisional DP rejection will be maintained.

### 35 USC § 102 Rejection:

(B)     Applicants have submitted that (for claim 4) Beauchamp's process of selecting screens

and tools cannot disclose or suggest ability to control or modify any functionality of any element

in a user interface (Appl. Rmrks pg. 21, bottom; pg. 22, top), in terms of *personalization system*

or *customizable interaction model* or *user interface generator tool* where the user has greater

freedom to design. The argument is based on some requirement that is not remotely construed

from reading the claim language. The Specifications mentions about delivery of a form of

Browser Application to a user based on the customization process by user from using a tool; and

when all this modification is done, the Internet Application as designed becomes the deliverable

(see Specifications, pg. 55-56); that is, the tool is enabling the internet Application to be

customized but the tool remains the tool, the deliverable being the Application; and in **no terms**

the claim recites specifics about a *user interface generator tool* that would render this generator

any more distinguishing than Beauchamp's model. There is no requirement explicitly conveyed

from claim 4 that the user have *absolute control of* and *greater freedom* or *ability to modify*

elements of a Gui interface **in a fashion that distinguishes** over Beauchamp's user ability to

perform designing tasks such as VIEW, CREATE, UPDATE, DELETE, MAINTENANCE,

SELECT and/or navigate between user-specified screens with text input into templates ( see col.

11, ; Fig. 4-5; Fig. 14-15; col. 15-16). The claim amounts to reciting overloaded terminology

repeating concepts like user-modifiable, user-customizable, user-modified, personalization data

being modifiable; when in fact by having a mere tool to enlist components from a model and

working on the fetched model to accommodate desired functionality to that model, as purported

by any modeling tool necessarily dictates user's ability and individualized control over the

model, i.e. able to opt what components can be added, deleted, created, restructured using the

very GUI interface of the tool; which is what Beauchamp discloses. The claim appears to be

reciting a simple GUI tool to enable personalizing of Application-specific data by a user, but this

simple paradigm has been phrased with superfluous phraseology, in regard to which the above

*Claims Objections* has been effectuated; and superfluous terminology without specific details

amounts to mere empty limitation without significant weight or proper merits. Therefore, broad

interpretation of this type of claim language (being without sufficient details) has been

reasonably applied, and one of ordinary skill in the art has established that Beauchamp in many

respects has fulfilled the limitations expressed in claim 4. Applicant's arguments fail to comply

with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a

patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably

distinguishes them from the references.

(C )    Applicants have submitted that Beauchamp predetermined and predefined screens

nowhere match Applicant's personalization system or 'interface generator tool' that would allow

a user 'to customize elements themselves' and the 'underlying functionality and resulting

interaction model between the user and any underlying applications' (Appl. Rmrks pg. 22,

bottom, pg 23, top).  The above remarks are not consistent with what the claim language

amounts to; and further appear to be fetched from outside the language of the claim.  The claim

language amounts to superfluously repeated terminology without substantial structural and

functional description details; and this deficiency has been discussed in part in the Claims

Objections.  And based on the rationale as set forth in sections B above, Beauchamp has fulfilled

such broad but virtually empty claimed limitation.

(D)    Applicants have submitted that claims 5-6 being dependent on claim 4 are allowable; and

this is not convincing in view of the above.  Further Applicants have submitted that

Beauchamp's approach ( in regard to claim 7) falls short of the dependency of the client code,

cannot apply to an more universalized and wider enterprise applications; nor does it give user the

ability to 'characterize user-modified functionality of the user customizable interaction model'

(Appl. Rmrks pg. 24, middle).  The arguments again appears to refer to specifics that does not

seem to be explicit from the way the claim language is made.  It is not construed how the claim

remotely enforces that the *user-modifiable functionality of user customizable interaction model*

suddenly negates Beauchamp's tool just because Beauchamp's limitedness to one client side

code does not even suggest about a user personalization capability being applicable across

universalized enterprise wide applications.  Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37

CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable

invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably

distinguishes them from the references. Applicants have further submitted that Beauchamp does

not provide timing of such customizable user interaction (Appl. Rmrks pg. 25, top). The

rejection has mapped this *timing* with a citation; and the argument appears to be mere allegation

without sufficient proof to the contrary thereof.

(E)     Applicants have submitted (for claim 15) that Beauchamp's thin client interface pre-

defined screens cannot be equated to true enterprise endeavor by which functionality of a model

via universal client can completely be customized, personalized and made available to the

enterprise (Appl. Rmrks pg. 25, middle). In reply, it is not evident how the above claim remotely

enforces that the *application user interface between Internet application and a user* suddenly

negates Beauchamp's tool just because Beauchamp's limitedness to one client side code does not

even suggest about a user personalization capability being applicable across universalized

enterprise wide applications. The claim lacks specifics as to be able to sufficiently enforce that

the Application tool not only can customize universalized or personalized application

functionality; but also can operated from non-predefined screens and further to define/create and

include all wider enterprise-related environments (e.g. geographical locales) and have all this

information incorporated from scratch to enable recreating of a model from anew that can be

utilized very far beyond the limit of a single client need. The broadness of the claim language is

not sufficient to preclude the teachings by Beauchamp from mapping the above steps of

customizing functionality of a model.

(F)     Applicants have submitted that claim 21 as amended has it that Beauchamp's thin client

predefined screens approach cannot solve the problem of providing complete flexibility (Appl.

Rmrks pg. 26, middle). How flexible or completely so a control can the client afford or exert

when working on a modeling tool is not clearly stated from the language of the claim besides the

words expressed as *user-modifiable, user modified, customization, personalization,*

*customizable.* Beauchamp as explained above have enable the client to modify to customize a

set of screens, template content according to that user. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with

37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable

invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably

distinguishes them from the references.

(G)     Applicants rationale to rebut the rejections of claims 29, 33, 37, 38, 41, 45, 49, 55 ... 77

amounts to repeat the same points raised about predefined screens and thin client (Appl. Rmrks

pg. 27). It is necessary to point out the any modeling tool starts from having predefined or

prestored default template, subcomponents of a prestored model or skeleton of components

thereof, and based upon these default subcomponents or skeleton container, the user with the

capability of the tool can modify, add, join, populate and recompile the above components to

reach a design. There is nothing from the claim language that teaches more than what a standard

model-based framework is all about, and there is nothing that Beauchamp tool is not fulfilling

this standard paradigm. The phraseology such as 'personalization system', 'customizable

interaction model' is construed as mapping exactly what a modeling tool is all about. Again, the

argument is not persuasive. The arguments raised against Beauchamp thin client focused merely

on XML tags resident to localized predefined screens ( Appl. Rmrks pg. 28) fall under the ambit

of the argument raised above (e.g. failure to provide complete flexibility ... entire enterprise

wide); and is not persuasive.

**35 USC § 103 Rejection:**

(C )    Applicants have that the combination of Beauchamp and Helgeson cannot provide

'reasonable expectation of success', absent any motivation to combine or prima facie providing

of reasonable suggestion to combine; hence Helgeson would be teaching away from Beauchamp

(Appl. Rmrks pg. 30, bottom, pg. 31, pg. 32). In reply, the fact that Beauchamp teaches

dependency on XML tags does not mean that XML form is not appropriate for wireless device,

at the time this Invention was made; and the fact that a wireless device is using a generic

interchange format does not preclude that a device like that of Helgeson can't be analogized to a

thin client. Besides, the claim does not provide specifics to prevent a wireless device to be a thin

client; nor does it prevent how wireless device and thin client using of XML metadata cannot be

analogized to enterprise wide application and extension away of XML tags ( or predefined

screens set) to reach a more universalized approach higher than that of a thin client or a wireless

device; nor does it explicitly teach a very specific purpose that would render the combining of

Helgeson and Beauchamp inapposite with that purpose. The argument raised in regard to lack of

motivation, "teaching away from reasonable success" and suggestion from the references

amounts to pure allegation without establishing convincing evidences proving so; and the points

raised against Beauchamp (Appl. Rmrks pg. 33) falls under the response as set forth in the

previous sections. Besides, in response to applicant's arguments against the references

individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the

rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In all, the claims amount to a amalgamation of overloaded (and mostly repetitive and confusing) terminology without specific teachings as to how this terminology is implemented in terms of structure, relationship and functionality to support the endeavor of the Applicant that appears to teach a applicability beyond a mere single client modeling tool. And while the claim is still subject to broad interpretation, Beauchamp is perceived as mapping the above terminology, mostly in an anticipatory manner.

The claims stand rejected as set forth in the Office Action; and if the Claims Objections are not corrected more USC § 112 or 101 statutory type of rejections will be effectuated.

### *Conclusion*

23.     Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A Vu whose telephone number is (272) 272-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-4:30PM/Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571)272-3756.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-3735 ( for non-official correspondence - please consult Examiner before using) or 571-273-8300 ( for official correspondence) or redirected to customer service at 571-272-3609.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tuan A Vu
Patent Examiner,
Art Unit 2193
April 27, 2007